REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Orino in view of Schairer. The Examiner states that Orino discloses in FIGURE 1 a communications system, having a transmitter, a controllable mirror, a photodiode, control circuitry and a receiver comprising a lens and a photodiode for receiving for receiving incident light from the transmitter through the lens. The Examiner states that Orino differs from Claim 1 and that Orino dies not disclose a reflective ring surrounding the lens for reflecting incident light from the transmitter back to the transmitter. The Examiner states that Schairer discloses a receiver which comprises a lens 2 and a reflective ring 13 surrounding the lens 2 capable of reflecting incident light from the transmitter back to the transmitter. The Examiner states that since it has reflective capability, it will reflect some of the incident light back to the transmitter. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to replace the lens unit 7 of Orinio with the lens 2 and a reflective ring 13 surrounding the lens 2 taught by Schairer.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Looking at FIGURE 1 of Schairer, it might appear, at first blush, that the incident light 14 is reflected as light 15. However, by examining the FIGURE, it is clear to those schooled in the art that this is not what is occurring. On the right side of the FIGURE they show the incident light 14 being received by the reflector 13. This incident light is reflected to a focal or collection point. See Col. 2, LL 61-67. On the otherhand, light that is emitted by the emitter 10 proceeds along the arrow shown as 15 so that the light that is emitted to the side is reflected of the reflector 13 and then projected out as a beam. This allows the device to operate as a transceiver. This is explained in Col. 3, LL 22-31:

> "The reflector 13 is arranged around and coaxially to an optical access OA of the components 6, 8 and 10 and around the lens 2. Further, the detector chip 8 and inventor chip 10 are located in the focal or

> collection point of the reflector 13, whereby, on the one hand, IR beams 14 coming from outside the lens 2 will be redirected to the detector chip 8. On the otherhand, IR beams 15 coming from the emitter chip 10, and bypassing the lens 2 are also radiated outwardly just as the beams passing through lens 2, thereby providing a significant increase in the sensitivity of the transceiver 1 and the transmission power of transceiver 1."

Accordingly, all of the light that is received is directed to the focal point and used to deactivate the detector chip 8. All of the light that is eminated from the device is eminated from the emitter chip 10. Although both lights are incident on the reflector ring 13, with light eminating from the ring, is not the light that is received, but light that is generated by the emitter chip 10. Accordingly, if one were to take the reflector 13 out of Schairer and substitute it for the lens 7 of Orino et al., no light received by the reflector would be reflected back to the transmitter. All that would be accomplished is the substitution of a reflector ring for a lens, but it would serve the same function, as the Examiner has suggested. The difference between what the Examiner has stated and what the reference states is that the light that is reflected back from the reflector ring is not the same as the light that is received by the reflector ring.

The Examiner states that regarding claims 2 and 3, Schairer discloses the reflector 13 and the lens adapted to each other and states that it is equivalent to the mirror element having a frame, a mirror surface, and a plurality of hinges and the reflector 13 comprises a plurality of corner cube elements.

We can not agree. The portion referred to by the Examiner, Col. 3, LL 9-10, does not in any way equate the reflector 13 to a mirror surface with a plurality of hinges since its not moveable. However, this portion of the reference, as well as the sentence that follows it, does describe the operation of the device in the same manner for radiating light from the emitter chip as described above. As to the utilization of corner cube elements, this term is not utilized by Schairer at all to describe their reflector. Furthermore, both claims 2 and 3 are dependent from Claim 1, and are therefore patentable for the same reasons.

As to claims 4 and 5, Claim 4 is dependent upon Claim 1 and Claim 5 is dependent is dependent upon Claim 4, therefore indirectly dependent upon Claim 1 and both are therefore patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants believe the Application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Texas Instruments Incorporated

By _____
William B. Kempler
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
(972) 917-5452